

Remarks

I. Summary of Office Action

Claims 1-4 and 8-10 were pending in the application.

The drawings were objected for failing to include a legend such as --Prior Art-- in FIGS. 1 and 2.

The Abstract was objected to for failing to commence on a separate sheet.

Claims 1, 4, and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Taylor et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,278,885 (hereinafter "Taylor").

Claims 2-3 and 8-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from Taylor in view of Yadav U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0149887 (hereinafter "Yadav").

The Examiner's objections to the drawings and abstract and rejections of the claims are hereby addressed.

II. Summary of Applicants' Reply

Applicants submit herewith amendments to the drawings and abstract in order to address the objections brought forth in the Office Action. No new matter has been added and the amendments are fully supported by the originally filed specification.

Applicants hereby amend claims 1-4 and 8-10 to more particularly and clearly define applicants' claimed invention. Applicants submit new claims 11 and 12 for examination on the merits. No new matter has been added and the amendments and new claims are fully supported by the specification. Support for the amendments and new claims can be found, for example, in the originally filed claims; and on pages 8-9, paragraphs 71-75, of the originally filed specification.

The Examiner's objections to the drawings and abstract and rejections of the claims are hereby addressed.

III. The Objection to the Drawings

Two corrected drawing sheets showing amended FIGS. 1 and 2 are submitted herewith in order to address the Examiner's objection to the drawings. These sheets shall replace the previously-provided sheets including FIGS. 1 and 2 filed with the original application.

The Office Action objected to FIGS. 1 and 2 for failing to include a legend. Applicants have amended FIGS. 1 and 2 to include a legend reading --Prior Art-- in order to address the Examiner's objection to the drawings.

Applicants submit that no new matter has been added as a result of these amendments. In view of the foregoing, applicants respectfully submit that the objections to the drawings brought forth in the Office Action have been properly addressed and respectfully request that the objections to the drawings be withdrawn.

IV. The Objection to the Specification

The Abstract was objected to for failing to commence on a separate sheet.

Applicants submit herewith a revised abstract which commences on a separate sheet. A marked-up copy of the abstract showing amendments to the abstract is also included. Applicants have amended the abstract to bring the abstract within the range of 50 to 150 words. No new matter has been added, and the

amendments are fully supported by the originally filed application.

In view of the foregoing, applicants respectfully request that the objection to the specification be withdrawn.

V. The Prior-Art Rejections of the Claims

Claims 1, 4, and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Taylor. Claims 2-3 and 8-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from Taylor in view of Yadav.

Independent claims 1, 4, and 10 are generally directed towards network security systems and methods for permitting trusted network communication programs to register server ports in a firewall. The system stores a list of trusted programs (i.e., "permitted" programs registered in an "internal permitted program storage"), and only allows "permitted" programs to register server ports in an internal permitted port storage. Once a port is registered, inbound packet traffic is allowed to bypass the firewall only if the destination ports of packets are registered ports.

More specifically, an internal permitted program storage registers programs which are permitted communication by the firewall. A port monitoring unit extracts information about a server port being used through a network communication program, and if the network communication program is registered in the permitted program storage, an internal permitted port storage registers the server port. A firewall flexible device determines whether a destination port of a packet of inbound

traffic is registered in the internal permitted port storage, and blocks the packet if the destination port is not registered.

Taylor describes a system and method for network access control using adaptive proxies. A configuration file prepared by a system administrator specifies a list of registered ports (col. 6, lines 4-12). When a connection control packet is received, a dynamic packet filter module (DPF) determines whether the port on which the packet was received is a registered port, and transfers information about the packet to a proxy only if the port is a registered port (col. 5, line 39, through col. 6, line 25). When a data packet is received, the packet is either sent to its destination if the packet belongs to an existing connection, or is processed through a transparency filter if the packet belongs to a new connection (col. 12, lines 20-39).

The Office Action alleges that Taylor fully anticipates applicants' claimed invention. In particular, the Office Action contends that Taylor teaches applicants' claimed "internal permitted program storage" used "for extracting [and registering] information about a program for which communication is permitted by the firewall", and further used for determining whether or not "information about [a] server port [should be registered] if [...] the network communication program extracted from the information [is] registered in the internal permitted program storage" (Office Action, page 3).

Applicants submit that Taylor in no way shows or suggests an internal permitted program storage for registering information about a permitted program, much less an internal permitted program storage used to determine whether to register a server

port for communication. Not only does Taylor fail to teach storing a list of "permitted programs", Taylor makes no mention of registering/blocking server ports based on the identity of network communication programs.

At best, Taylor teaches a "configuration information file" used to store "information on which ports are registered [and] various filter rules to be applied for specific connections" (col. 6, lines 44-46). The configuration information file of Taylor, however, neither stores information about permitted programs, nor is used for determining whether or not a server port should be registered in an internal permitted port storage.

If anything, applicants submit that Taylor teaches that the determination of whether or not a server port should be registered in an internal permitted port storage should be done by a system administrator. Indeed, Taylor teaches that a system administrator must manually register a port each time a network communication program requires a new or different server port for communication (col. 6, lines 4-5 and 53-55). In contrast, applicants' invention enables server ports to automatically be registered in an internal permitted port storage based on the identity of a network communication program using the port. For example, a program registered in applicants' internal permitted program storage and requiring a new server port for operation (e.g., after the program undergoes a software update) can automatically register the port without the intervention of a system administrator. At least because Taylor teaches registering ports for a firewall manually, applicants submit that Taylor teaches away from the claimed system and method for registering permitted programs in an internal permitted program storage and automatically registering ports based on the identity of 'trusted' network communication programs.

For at least the reason that Taylor fails to teach or suggest an internal permitted program storage, and further because Taylor teaches away from applicants' method for automatically registering server ports based on the identity of a communication program, applicants submit that applicants' claims 1, 4, and 10 are novel and non-obvious. Claims 2-3, 8, and 9, which each depend from one of claims 1 and 4, are allowable at least because they depend from allowable claims. In view of the foregoing, applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1-4 and 8-10 be withdrawn.

VI. Conclusion

The foregoing brings the drawings and specification in accordance with statutory requirements and demonstrates that claims 1-4 and 8-12 are allowable. This application is therefore in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance are accordingly respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 10, 2010

By: /Jae Y. Park/

JAE Y. PARK

Reg. No.: 62,629

Attorney for applicants

Kile, Goekjian, Reed & McManus, PLLC

1200 New Hampshire Avenue NW, Suite 570

Washington, DC 20036

Tel. No.: 202-263-0809